



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of this right, and will furnish ground for recovery for consequent mental anguish. *Larson v. Chase*, 47 Minn. 307, 50 N. W. 238; *Kyles v. Southern Ry. Co.*, 147 N. C. 394, 61 S. E. 278. But see *Long v. Chicago, R. I. & P. Ry. Co.*, 15 Okla. 512, 86 Pac. 289. There is also authority for such recovery where the injury is merely negligent. *Hale v. Bonner*, 82 Tex. 33, 17 S. W. 605. Cf. *Birmingham T. & T. Co. v. Still*, 61 So. 611 (Ala.). *Contra*, *Hall v. Jackson*, 24 Colo. App. 225, 134 Pac. 151. The limited character of the right, however, is shown by the fact that it may be defeated by the deceased's contract. *Painter v. U. S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co.*, 91 Atl. 158 (Md.). Even in the absence of such a limitation, however, the principal case properly denies recovery, for the legal right is vested in the next of kin, and he alone may sue for the mental anguish caused by any mutilation.

EASEMENTS — MODES OF ACQUISITION: IMPLIED GRANT — RIGHT TO WATER PUMPED BY GASOLINE ENGINE ON ADJOINING LAND. — The defendant owned a tract of land, one part of which was supplied with water from a well on another part, which was pumped by a gasoline engine there situated. The *quasi*-dominant tenement was first leased to the plaintiff, and then sold to a third party, who later conveyed to the plaintiff. Neither deed mentioned the water rights, but the pipes were visible and the use of the system necessary to the full enjoyment of the land. The defendant then cut off the water, shut up the pump-house and blocked up the way thereto. The plaintiff now seeks to enjoin him from further interference with her rights. *Held*, that she is entitled to the relief sought. *Adams v. Gordon*, 106 N. E. 517 (Ill.).

In order to imply the grant of an easement, it must be apparent, continuous, and reasonably necessary to the enjoyment of the premises conveyed. *Spencer v. Kilmer*, 151 N. Y. 390, 45 N. E. 865. The word "continuous," has been the subject of much dispute. Some have thought that it required the easement to be capable of enjoyment without the intervention of man, as, for example, a drain or light and air. See GALE, EASEMENTS, 3 ed., p. 83. On this theory, the implied grant of a right of way has been held impossible. *Bonelli Bros. v. Blakemore*, 66 Miss. 136. But the view now generally adopted is that the easement is continuous if the tenements are permanently adapted to its enjoyment. *Larsen v. Peterson*, 53 N. J. Eq. 88, 30 Atl. 1094; *Baker v. Rice*, 56 Oh. St. 463, 47 N. E. 653. See GALE, EASEMENTS, 8 ed., p. 137. Under this view the grant of an easement to water pumped by an hydraulic ram has been implied. *Tooth v. Bryce*, 50 N. J. Eq. 589, 25 Atl. 182. The doctrine of implied easements, however, should be confined to narrow limits, for it does not depend on any intention of the parties, and is also hostile to the policy of the registry system. See 1 TIFFANY, REAL PROPERTY, p. 710. The principal case extends the rule farther than any previous decision, and is therefore to be regretted. But see *Foote v. Yarlott*, 238 Ill. 54, 87 N. E. 62; *Eliason v. Grove*, 85 Md. 215.

EMINENT DOMAIN — COMPENSATION — VALIDITY OF STATUTE EXTINGUISHING RIGHT TO COMPENSATION WITHOUT NOTICE. — A statute provided that all private owners of easements in any street which a city intended to close must present their claims for compensation within six years after the filing of the map by the city. The city filed such a map in 1895 to close two streets, in which private owners had easements. In 1898 the streets were closed. In 1906 the city condemned the fee in the streets for another purpose, and the owners' right to substantial compensation depended on the question whether the easements had been extinguished. *Held*, that the easements still exist, on the ground that the statute is unconstitutional. *In the Matter of the City of New York*, 212 N. Y. 538.

An abutter's private easement in a street cannot be extinguished without compensation. *Schneider v. City of Detroit*, 72 Mich. 240, 40 N. W. 329. Any